arXiv:1608.06350v2 [math.CO] 4 Sep 2016

Characterizing Bipartite Graphs which Admit a k-NU Polymorphism via Absolute Retracts

Adam Jaffe

ajaffe@uwaterloo.ca

University of Waterloo, 200 University Avenue W., Waterloo, ON, Canada, N2L 3G1

Abstract: We first introduce the class of bipartite absolute retracts with respect to tree obstructions with at most k leaves. Then, using the theory of homomorphism duality, we show that this class of absolute retracts coincides exactly with the bipartite graphs which admit a $(k+1)$-ary near-unanimity polymorphism. This result mirrors the case for reflexive graphs and generalizes a known result for bipartite graphs which admit a 3-ary near-unanimity polymorphism.

Keywords: Absolute retract, Duality, Near-unanimity polymorphism

AMS subject classifications: 05C75, 08B05

1 Introduction

Given a digraph $\mathbb{H}$ with vertex set H, a *k-ary near-unanimity polymorphism*, or k-NU polymorphism, is a graph homomorphism $f : \mathbb{H}^k \to \mathbb{H}$ that satisfies the near-unanimity property

$$f(x,\dots,x) = f(y,x,x,\dots,x) = f(x,y,x,\dots,x) = \cdots = f(x,x,x,\dots,y) = x,$$

for all vertices $x, y \in H$. The problem of determining which digraphs admit a near-unanimity polymorphism of some arity has been studied both for reflexive digraphs, where every vertex has a loop, and for simple graphs. It turns out that if a simple graph is to admit a near-unanimity polymorphism, then it must be bipartite [4].

The concept of *absolute retracts* is intimately linked to near-unanimity polymorphisms. A graph is an absolute retract with respect to isometry if it is a retract of each graph in which it is isometrically embedded. Absolute retracts and their relation to near-unanimity polymorphisms have been studied for both reflexive and simple graphs - see for instance [1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8]. In particular, Bandelt [7] showed that a bipartite graph admits a 3-ary near-unanimity polymorphism if and only if it is an absolute retract with respect to isometry. For reflexive digraphs, the connection between the two concepts has been worked out for arbitrary arities; a reflexive digraph admits a $(k+1)$-ary near-unanimity polymorphism if and only if it is an absolute retract with respect to tree obstructions with at most k leaves [5, 8].

In this article, we establish a similar characterization of bipartite graphs which admit a k-ary near-unanimity polymorphism thus mirroring the reflexive case and generalizing Bandelt's result for bipartite graphs. The technique crucially relies upon the finite homomorphism duality result for strongly bipartite digraphs admitting a near-unanimity polymorphism proven by Feder et al. [4].

2 Preliminaries

A *digraph* is a relational structure with only a single binary relation. A digraph will be denoted with a blackboard font (e.g. $\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H}$) while the corresponding Latin equivalent (e.g. G, H) will be used to denote the vertex set. If $\mathbb{H}$ is a digraph then $E(\mathbb{H})$ denotes the binary relation on $\mathbb{H}$. A member of $E(\mathbb{H})$ is called an *edge*. An edge will typically be denoted with no parentheses - e.g. the edge (a, b) will be written simply as ab.

An *undirected graph* is a digraph whose edge relation is symmetric. If $\mathbb{H}$ is an undirected graph and $u \in H$ is a vertex, the *degree of* u, denoted $deg(u)$, is the number of edges incident to u. A *strongly biparite digraph* is a digraph with the property that its vertex set may be partitioned into a set of sinks and a set of sources. If a graph is bipartite then it is undirected. A digraph is non-trivial if it has more than one vertex and at least one edge. If $\mathbb{H}$ is a digraph, then $\mathbb{H}_u$ is the undirected graph that results from making all edges in $\mathbb{H}$ symmetric. A digraph $\mathbb{H}$ is *connected* if there is a path between any two vertices in $\mathbb{H}_u$. If $a, b \in H$, the *distance between* a *and* b *in* $\mathbb{H}$ is the length of a shortest path between a and b in $\mathbb{H}_u$ and will be denoted by $d_{\mathbb{H}}(a, b)$.

A *subgraph of* $\mathbb{H}$ is a digraph $\mathbb{H}'$ such that $H' \subseteq H$ and $E(\mathbb{H}') \subseteq E(\mathbb{H})$. For this article, if $\mathbb{H}$ is an undirected graph then any subgraph of $\mathbb{H}$ is assumed to also be an undirected graph. In other words, when removing an edge from $\mathbb{H}$ to yield a proper subgraph, both orientations of the edge must be removed.

Let $\mathbb{G}$ and $\mathbb{H}$ be digraphs. A *homomorphism* from $\mathbb{G}$ to $\mathbb{H}$ is a map f from G to H such that if ab is an edge in $\mathbb{G}$ then $f(a)f(b)$ is an edge in $\mathbb{H}$. Suppose that $\mathbb{G}$ contains $\mathbb{H}$ as an induced subgraph. $\mathbb{H}$ is a *retract* of $\mathbb{G}$ if there exists a homomorphism $r : \mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{H}$ that acts as the identity on H. The map r is called a *retraction*. If $\mathbb{H}$ is a retract of $\mathbb{G}$ we write $\mathbb{H} \lhd \mathbb{G}$.

Let $\mathbb{H}_1, \ldots, \mathbb{H}_k$ be digraphs. The *relational product of* $\mathbb{H}_1, \ldots \mathbb{H}_k$ is the digraph $\mathbb{H}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{H}_k$ with vertex set $H_1 \times \cdots \times H_k$ and an edge between $(a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ and $(b_1, \ldots, b_k)$ if and only if $a_i b_i \in E(\mathbb{H}_i)$ for each $i \in \{ 1, \ldots, k \}$. The digraph $\mathbb{H}^k$ is the relational product of k copies of $\mathbb{H}$.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a digraph. An $\mathbb{H}$-*coloured digraph* is a digraph $\mathbb{G}$ equipped with unary relations $S_h \subseteq G$ for every $h \in H$. If $v \in S_h(\mathbb{G})$ then we say that v is *coloured with* h. $\mathbb{H}$ supports a natural $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraph, denoted $\mathbb{H}^c$, where $S_h(\mathbb{H}) = \{ h \}$ for all $h \in H$. If $\mathbb{G}$ contains $\mathbb{H}$ as a subgraph then we can colour each vertex $h \in H$ with h. Explicitly, let $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$ be the $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraph where $S_h(\mathbb{G}) = \{ h \}$ for all $h \in H$ and whose underlying digraph is $\mathbb{G}$.

Homomorphisms between $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraphs are defined in the natural way. Let $\mathbb{X}$ and $\mathbb{Y}$ be $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraphs. A map $f : \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{Y}$ is an $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraph homomorphism if it is a homomorphism of the underlying digraphs from $\mathbb{X}$ to $\mathbb{Y}$ and satisfies $f(S_h(X)) \subseteq S_h(Y)$ for each $h \in H$. A *substructure* of $\mathbb{X}$ is an $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraph $\mathbb{X}'$ whose underlying digraph is a subgraph of the underlying digraph of $\mathbb{X}$ and $S_h(X') \subseteq S_h(X)$ for each $h \in H$. $\mathbb{X}'$ is a *proper substructure* if $\mathbb{X}'$ is a substructure

of $\mathbb{X}$ and $\mathbb{X}' \neq \mathbb{X}$. The distance between two vertices in an $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraph is the distance between the vertices in the underlying digraph.

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a digraph and let $\mathbb{X}$ and $\mathbb{Y}$ be $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraphs. $\mathbb{X}$ is an *obstruction for* $\mathbb{Y}$ if $\mathbb{X}$ does not admit a homomorphism to $\mathbb{Y}$ and we write $\mathbb{X} \nrightarrow \mathbb{Y}$. If $\mathbb{X}$ is not an obstruction for $\mathbb{Y}$ then we say that $\mathbb{X}$ is *feasible for* $\mathbb{Y}$ and write $\mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}$. $\mathbb{X}$ is a *critical obstruction* for $\mathbb{Y}$ if it is an obstruction for $\mathbb{Y}$ yet any proper substructure of $\mathbb{X}$ is feasible for $\mathbb{Y}$.

Let $\mathbb{X}$ and $\mathbb{Y}$ be $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraphs for some digraph $\mathbb{H}$. If $\mathbb{X}$ is an obstruction for $\mathbb{Y}$, then there must be a substructure of $\mathbb{X}$ that is a critical obstruction for $\mathbb{Y}$. Explicitly, among all substructures of $\mathbb{X}$ that are still obstructions for $\mathbb{Y}$, any minimal substructure is a critical obstruction for $\mathbb{Y}$.

We can rephrase the concept of a retraction in terms of homomorphisms between $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraphs. If $\mathbb{G}$ contains $\mathbb{H}$ as an induced subgraph then $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$ is feasible for $\mathbb{H}^c$ if and only if $\mathbb{H}$ is a retract of $\mathbb{G}$. There are simple necessary conditions for $\mathbb{H}$ to be a retract of $\mathbb{G}$. For instance, $\mathbb{G}$ and $\mathbb{H}$ must have the same chromatic number, and $\mathbb{H}$ must be isometrically embedded in $\mathbb{G}$ in the sense that for any $a, b \in H$ it must be that $d_{\mathbb{H}}(a, b) = d_{\mathbb{G}}(a, b)$. Each necessary condition for the existence of a retraction can be used to define a class of graphs, the absolute retracts, for whom the necessary condition is also sufficient. The following definition gives rise to a necessary condition for the existence of a retraction and thus a class of absolute retracts.

Definition 2.3.

(1) Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a bipartite graph. $\mathbb{T}$ is an $\mathbb{H}$-*tree* if $\mathbb{T}$ is an $\mathbb{H}$-coloured tree such that the leaves are exactly the coloured elements of $\mathbb{T}$. Further, we require that if $v_a, v_b \in T$ are leaves with colours a, b respectively, then $d_{\mathbb{T}}(v_a, v_b) \equiv d_{\mathbb{H}}(a, b) \pmod 2$.

(2) Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a strongly bipartite digraph. We say that $\mathbb{T}$ is a *directed* $\mathbb{H}$-*tree* if $\mathbb{T}$ is an $\mathbb{H}$-coloured strongly bipartite tree such that the leaves are exactly the coloured elements of $\mathbb{T}$. Further, if a leaf $l \in T$ is coloured with $h \in H$ that is a sink (or source) in $\mathbb{H}$, then the unique edge incident to l must be incoming (resp. outgoing).

In both cases we require that each leaf is uniquely coloured.

Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a bipartite graph and $\mathbb{H}$ a retract of $\mathbb{G}$. Then any $\mathbb{H}$-tree $\mathbb{T}$ that is feasible for $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$ must also be feasible for $\mathbb{H}^c$. Indeed, if $r : \mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^c$ and $\phi : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$ are homomorphisms, then certainly $r \circ \phi$ is a homomorphism from $\mathbb{T}$ to $\mathbb{H}^c$. In other words, for $\mathbb{H}$ to be a retraction of $\mathbb{G}$, each $\mathbb{H}$-tree obstruction for $\mathbb{H}^c$ must also be an obstruction for $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$. This is the necessary condition used to define the following class of absolute retracts - with the caveat that we restrict to $\mathbb{H}$-tree obstructions with a bounded number of leaves.

Definition 2.4. Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a bipartite graph and $k \geq 2$. We say that $\mathbb{H}$ is a *bipartite absolute retract with respect to k-trees* if whenever a bipartite graph $\mathbb{G}$ contains $\mathbb{H}$ as an induced subgraph such that all $\mathbb{H}$-tree obstructions for $\mathbb{H}^c$ with at most k leaves are also obstructions for $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$, then $\mathbb{H}$ is a retract of $\mathbb{G}$.

The bipartite absolute retracts with respect to 2-trees are exactly the bipartite absolute retracts with respect to isometry. Indeed, if a bipartite graph $\mathbb{H}$ is isometrically embedded in a bipartite graph $\mathbb{G}$, then all $\mathbb{H}$-tree obstructions for $\mathbb{H}^c$ with 2

leaves must also be obstructions for $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$. The following result generalizes Bandelt's [6] result for graphs which admit a 3-NU polymorphism to graphs which admit a k-NU polymorphism for arbitrary k, the proof of which appears at the end of the next section.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a connected, bipartite graph and $k \geq 2$. $\mathbb{H}$ is a bipartite absolute retract with respect to k-trees if and only if it admits a $(k+1)$-NU polymorphism.*

3 Trees and Duality

Definition 3.1.

(1) Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a digraph. A *homomorphism duality* for $\mathbb{H}^c$ is a set $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraphs such that if $\mathbb{X}$ is an $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraph, then $\mathbb{X} \nrightarrow \mathbb{H}^c$ if and only if there exists some $\mathbb{G} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{X}$. If $\mathbb{H}^c$ admits a finite homomorphism duality then we say $\mathbb{H}^c$ has *finite homomorphism duality*.

(2) Let $\mathbb{H}$ be an undirected graph. An *undirected homomorphism duality for* $\mathbb{H}^c$ is a set $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathbb{H}$-coloured undirected graphs such that if $\mathbb{X}$ is an $\mathbb{H}$-coloured undirected graph, then $\mathbb{X} \nrightarrow \mathbb{H}^c$ if and only if there exists some $\mathbb{G} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{X}$.

Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a strongly bipartite digraph. If an $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraph $\mathbb{X}$ were to admit a homomorphism to $\mathbb{H}^c$ then it must be strongly bipartite, have no vertex with multiple colours, and it must be coloured consistently with $\mathbb{H}$ in the sense that a sink (or source) in $\mathbb{X}$ cannot be coloured with a source (or sink) in $\mathbb{H}$. Thus any homomorphism duality for $\mathbb{H}^c$ must include the following critical obstructions.

Definition 3.2 (See [4])**.** Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a non-trivial, connected, strongly bipartite digraph with source set D and sink set U. The *elementary critical obstructions* for $\mathbb{H}$, denoted by $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{H}^c)$, are the following $\mathbb{H}$-coloured digraphs:

(A) For all distinct $a, b \in H$, a single vertex coloured with a and b.

(B) For all $d \in D$, two vertices with a single (directed) edge joining them, with sink coloured with d.

(C) For all $u \in U$, two vertices with a single (directed) edge joining them, with source coloured with u.

(D) The directed path of length 2 with no coloured vertices.

Similarly, we can define elementary critical obstructions for bipartite graphs.

Definition 3.3. Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a non-trivial, connected, bipartite graph. The elementary critical obstructions for $\mathbb{H}$, denoted by $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{H}^c)$, are the following $\mathbb{H}$-coloured undirected graphs:

(A) For all distinct $a, b \in H$, a single vertex coloured with a and b.

(B) For all $a, b \in H$, a path of length l joining a vertex coloured with a to a vertex coloured with b such that $d_{\mathbb{H}}(a, b) \not\equiv l \pmod 2$.

(C) All cycles of odd length with no coloured vertices.

Note that the elementary critical obstructions for both strongly bipartite digraphs and for bipartite graphs are all indeed critical obstructions. There are only a finite number of elementary critical obstructions for strongly bipartite digraphs, however this is not true for bipartite graphs.

The following result will be key in proving Theorem 1.

Lemma 1 (See [4, Theorem 3.1 and the proof of Theorem 4.2]). *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a connected, strongly bipartite digraph. Then $\mathbb{H}^c$ has finite homomorphism duality if and only if $\mathbb{H}$ admits an NU polymorphism. Further, if $\mathbb{H}$ admits a $(k+1)$-NU polymorphism, then $\mathbb{H}^c$ has a finite homomorphism duality consisting of $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{H}^c)$ and a finite number of directed $\mathbb{H}$-trees with at most k leaves, each of which are critical obstructions for $\mathbb{H}^c$.*

Let $\mathbb{H}$ be an undirected graph. The following construction gives a correspondence between $\mathbb{H}$-coloured undirected graphs and undirected graphs that contain $\mathbb{H}$ as an induced subgraph. Let $\mathbb{G}$ be an $\mathbb{H}$-coloured undirected graph such that no vertex has more than one colour and there are no edges between coloured vertices whose colours are not adjacent in $\mathbb{H}$. Define a graph that contains $\mathbb{H}$ as an induced subgraph called the $\mathbb{H}$-*embed* of $\mathbb{G}$, denoted $\mathbb{G}^{\hookrightarrow}$, as follows.

Let U be the set of non-coloured vertices of $\mathbb{G}$. $\mathbb{G}^{\hookrightarrow}$ has vertex set $H \cup U$ and edges on each part as they are in their original graph. Moreover there is a (symmetric) edge between $h \in H$ and $u \in U$ if u is adjacent in $\mathbb{G}$ to some $c \in S_h(\mathbb{G})$.

Lemma 2 (See [5, Lemma 5.6]). *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be an undirected graph and let $\mathbb{G}$ be an $\mathbb{H}$-coloured undirected graph that satisfies the requirements of the above construction. Then $\mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{H}^c$ if and only if $\mathbb{H} \lhd \mathbb{G}^{\hookrightarrow}$.*

The following lemma allows us to leverage the power of Lemma 1 for use on bipartite graphs.

Lemma 3 (See [4, Lemma 5.1]). *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a bipartite graph with partition A and B. Let $\mathbb{H}_d$ be the strongly bipartite digraph constructed from $\mathbb{H}$ by directing all the edges from A to B (or from B to A). Then $\mathbb{H}$ admits a k-NU polymorphism if and only if $\mathbb{H}_d$ admits a k-NU polymorphism.*

Proof of Theorem 1. ($\Rightarrow$) The argument for this implication is adapted from [8, Lemma 3.5]. Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a connected, bipartite absolute retract with respect to k-trees. Let $\mathbb{K}$ be the $\mathbb{H}$-coloured undirected graph with underlying graph $\mathbb{H}^{k+1}$ and each near-unanimous (constant, except perhaps for one coordinate) vertex coloured with its near-unanimous value. Then $\mathbb{H}$ admits a $(k+1)$-NU polymorphism if and only if $\mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{H}^c$, which by Lemma 2 is true if and only if $\mathbb{H} \lhd \mathbb{K}^{\hookrightarrow}$. Note that $\mathbb{K}^{\hookrightarrow}$ contains $\mathbb{H}$ as an induced subgraph and is bipartite.

Suppose that $\mathbb{H}$ is not a retract of $\mathbb{K}^{\hookrightarrow}$. Then there is an $\mathbb{H}$-tree $\mathbb{T}$ with at most k leaves that admits a homomorphism $\phi : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{K}^{\hookrightarrow}_{\mathbb{H}}$, but is an obstruction for $\mathbb{H}^c$. Since there is a substructure of $\mathbb{T}$ that is a critical obstruction for $\mathbb{H}^c$ and is again an $\mathbb{H}$-tree, we may assume that $\mathbb{T}$ is a critical obsutrction for $\mathbb{H}^c$. Moreover, we may assume that $\mathbb{T}$ is minimal in the following sense: among all critical $\mathbb{H}$-tree obstructions of $\mathbb{H}^c$ with at most k leaves which are feasible for $\mathbb{K}^{\hookrightarrow}_{\mathbb{H}}$, $\mathbb{T}$ has the least number of vertices.

Suppose that $u \in T$ is a non-coloured vertex but $\phi(u) \in \mathbb{K}^{\hookrightarrow}_{\mathbb{H}}$ is coloured with some $h \in H$. Split $\mathbb{T}$ into $deg(u)$ $\mathbb{H}$-trees by removing u from $\mathbb{T}$ and then adding u back as a leaf coloured with h to each of the resulting trees. At least one of the resulting trees, say $\mathbb{T}'$, must be an obstruction for $\mathbb{H}^c$. This contradicts the minimality of $\mathbb{T}$, since there is a substructure of $\mathbb{T}'$ that is a critical obstruction of $\mathbb{H}^c$ yet still admits a homomorphism to $\mathbb{K}^{\hookrightarrow}_{\mathbb{H}}$. Thus the image under ϕ of any non-coloured vertex of $\mathbb{T}$ is non-coloured in $\mathbb{K}^{\hookrightarrow}_{\mathbb{H}}$.

Let $l_1, \ldots, l_k$ be the leaves of $\mathbb{T}$. For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, let $h_i \in H$ be the colour of l_i and let $u_i \in T$ be its unique neighbour. Then $\phi(u_i) \in H^{k+1}$ is adjacent to the unique vertex coloured with h_i in $K^{\hookrightarrow}_{\mathbb{H}}$. Therefore, at least k of the coordinates of

$\phi(u_i)$ are adjacent to h_i in $\mathbb{H}$. Thus there is some index $p \in \{ 1, \dots k+1 \}$ such that for every $i \in \{ 1, \dots, k \}$, $h_i \pi_p(\phi(u_i))$ is an edge of $\mathbb{H}$, where π_p is the $p-th$ projection. Thus the map from $\mathbb{T}$ to $\mathbb{H}^c$ that sends leaves to their colour and sends non-leaves x to $\pi_p(\phi(x))$ is a homomorphism. This contradicts the fact that $\mathbb{T}$ is an obstruction for $\mathbb{H}^c$. Therefore any $\mathbb{H}$-tree obstruction for $\mathbb{H}^c$ must also be an obstruction for $\mathbb{K}^{\hookrightarrow}$, hence $\mathbb{H} \lhd \mathbb{K}^{\hookrightarrow}$.

($\Leftarrow$) Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a bipartite graph that admits a $(k+1)$-NU polymorphism. Let $\mathbb{H}_d$ be the strongly bipartite digraph made from $\mathbb{H}$ by directing the edges (in one of the two ways). $\mathbb{H}_d$ still admits a $(k+1)$-NU polymorphism by Lemma 3. Thus by Lemma 1, $\mathbb{H}_d^c$ has a finite homomorphism duality consisting of $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{H}_d^c)$ and a finite set $\mathcal{T}$ of directed $\mathbb{H}$-trees with at most k leaves which are critical obstructions for $\mathbb{H}_d^c$. Let $\mathcal{T}_u = \{ \mathbb{T}_u : \mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T} \}$.

We claim that $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{H}^c) \cup \mathcal{T}_u$ is an undirected homomorphism duality for $\mathbb{H}^c$. Certainly all members of the proposed duality are obstructions for $\mathbb{H}^c$. Suppose that $\mathbb{X}$ is an $\mathbb{H}$-coloured undirected graph that is an obstruction for $\mathbb{H}^c$. We may assume that no member of $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{H}^c)$ admits a homomorphism to $\mathbb{X}$. Then $\mathbb{X}$ is bipartite and each coloured vertex is uniquely coloured. Moreover, since no elementary critical obstruction of type (B) admits a homomorphism to $\mathbb{X}$, we may direct the edges of $\mathbb{X}$ to yield a strongly bipartite digraph $\mathbb{X}_d$ that is consistently $\mathbb{H}_d$-coloured, in the sense that if a coloured vertex of $\mathbb{X}_d$ is a source (or sink) then its colour is a source (or sink) in $\mathbb{H}_d$. Since $\mathbb{X}_d$ is an obstruction for $\mathbb{H}_d$ and no elementary critical obstructions for $\mathbb{H}_d$ admit a homomorphism to $\mathbb{X}_d$, it must be that some $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}$ is feasible for $\mathbb{X}_d$. Thus $\mathbb{T}_u$ is feasible for $\mathbb{X}$, verifying the claim.

Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a bipartite graph that contains $\mathbb{H}$ as an induced subgraph and all $\mathbb{H}$-tree obstructions for $\mathbb{H}^c$ with at most k leaves are also obstructions of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$. Suppose that $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}} \nrightarrow \mathbb{H}^c$. Then since no elementary critical obstruction of $\mathbb{H}$ admits a homomorphism to $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$, it must be that some $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}_u$ admits a homomorphism to $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$. This is a contradiction since $\mathbb{T}$ is an $\mathbb{H}$-tree obstruction with at most k leaves. Thus it must be that $\mathbb{H} \lhd \mathbb{G}$.

□

4 Further problems

Bandelt et al. were able to characterize the internal strucutre of bipartite graphs which admit a 3-NU polymorphism using the notion of the *interval* between two vertices of a graph [6]. Given a bipartite graph $\mathbb{H}$ and two vertices $u, v \in H$, the *interval between u and v* is the set of all vertices on a shortest path between u and v,

$$I(u,v) = \{ x \in H : d(x,u) + d(x,v) = d(u,v) \}.$$

A bipartite graph $\mathbb{H}$ admits a 3-NU polymorphism if and only if for all $u, v \in H$ with $d_{\mathbb{H}}(u,v) \geq 3$ the neighbours of u in $I(u,v)$ all share a second common neighbour in $I(u,v)$. A similar internal characterization of bipartite graphs which admit an NU polymorphism of larger arities remains to be found.

Acknowledgements

I'm thankful for the guidance that my supervisor, Ross Willard, generously provided throughout the course of this research. I would like to acknowledge the support pro-

vided by the University of Waterloo and the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

References

[1] R. Brewster, T. Feder, P. Hell, J. Huang, G. MacGillivray, *Near-unanimity functions and varities of reflexive graphs*, SIAM J. Discrete Math., 22 (2008), pp. 938-960.

[2] H. J. Bandelt, M. Farber, P. Hell, *Absolute reflexive retracts and absolute bipartite retracts*, Discrete Appl. Math., 44 (1993), pp. 9-20.

[3] R. Brewster, G. MacGillivray, *Building blocks for the variety of absolute retracts*, Discrete Math., 306 (2006), pp. 1758-1764.

[4] T. Feder, P.Hell, B. Larose, C. Loten, M. Siggers, and C. Tardif, *Graphs admitting k-NU operations. Part 2: The irreflexive case,* SIAM J. Discrete Math., 28 (2014), pp. 817-834.

[5] T. Feder, P. Hell, B. Larose, C. Loten, M. Siggers, and C. Tardif, *Graphs admitting k-NU operations. Part 1: The reflexive case,* SIAM J. Discrete Math., 27 (2013), pp. 1639-2166.

[6] H.J. Bandelt, A. Dahlmann, and H. Schutte, *Absolute retracts of bipartite graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math., 16 (1987), pp. 121-215.

[7] H.J. Bandelt, *Graphs with edge-preserving majority functions,* Discrete Math., 103 (1992), pp. 1-5.

[8] C. Loten, *Retractions of Chordal and Related Graphs*, Ph.D thesis, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada, 2003.